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Our Extralinguistic Variables Series

- Last quarter we began discussing the importance of how we as sociolinguists utilize, theorize, and present our data with regard to extralinguistic variables.
- Our conversations began with Kirby presenting their research into the role of gender in the social sciences.
- After this, it was proposed that we explore social class as the next factor.
Our Extralinguistic Variables Series

- Conversation began with Savage et al (2013)
  - Introduced us to CAMSIS
- Why important for sociolinguists?
  - Considers social network
  - Can be integrated with Bourdieu's conceptions of capital
    - Eckert (1989) invoked Bourdieu's framework in relation to gender
- Last week, began looking at the theoretical development of CAMSIS
Development of CAMSIS

- Bergman & Joye (2001): brief comparison of what CAMSIS is in relation to other methods of determining SES

- Does not focus on strict class hierarchies or hierarchical structures from
  - Different from the Goldthorpe model, which draws heavily on Marxist/Weberian thought
Development of CAMSIS

- Why was CAMSIS developed?
  - Desire to address systemic and structural issues of inequality (Stewart & Blackburn, 1975)

- How can SES measures address inequality?
  - Through looking at variables such as class, status, and social mobility

- Are these measures valid?
  - "Ironically, the failure of sociology has lain in it not being sufficiently 'social.'" (Blackburn & Prandy, 1997, p. 491)
Development of CAMSIS

- With regards to problems of social class:
  - Should it be ordered categorically or hierarchically?
  - How can class be defined?

- “Sociologists, for the most part, seek to privilege their (‘objective’) categorizations over the (‘subjective’) ones of members of society, despite the fact that it is the latter who are actively engaged in the social processes by which the categories are, or are not, made real. The usual consequence is that processes of ‘class formation’ are seen as ones in which members of society bring their categorizations and identities in line with those of sociologists. However, it is clear that they have so far failed to do so.” (Prandy, 2002, pp. 588-589)

However, the liberal individualism of which the achievement approach is accused is not a new development. It is a bringing out of assumptions that are shared with the more traditional, ‘class’ mobility approach and entails a false separation of individuals from their social structure; mobility is individual movement between fixed structural locations. People move through the structure rather like walkers wandering over a featureless landscape. Some may move faster than others and some may stay roughly in the same place, but this has little if anything to do with the terrain (structure). There has been no more than a very limited realisation that the landscape is not flat. Hope (1981:19) observed that popular conceptions of mobility are about ‘people moving up or down a vertical hierarchy’, but this had not penetrated sociological research. While sociologists had always used conventional orderings for the categories of the mobility table, ‘traditionally their methods of analysis have taken no account of the ordering’. In fact the concern has been so focused on movement that not only is the vertical dimension missing but the whole landscape seems to disappear. In mobility research, individuals move by their own achievements, or more often through random processes, between fixed points in a dimensionless space.

Blackburn & Prandy, 1997, p. 493
Development of CAMSIS

• Important underlying assumption:
  – “According to the CAMSIS approach, individuals are embedded in socially moderated networks of relationships within which they engage in social, cultural, political, and economic interactions, which are qualitatively and quantitatively different from interactions with persons who are more distant from these networks.”

(Bergman & Joye, 2004, p. 34)
Development of CAMSIS

- Original design of the scale:
  - Looks at relationships between pairs of individuals in order to create a stratification metric
  - For each individual, questions were asked about:
    - The occupations of four friends
    - The occupation of a spouse
Development of CAMSIS

- Critique about the development:
  - women were under-represented, and usually only as spouses
  - this meant that marriage and friendship were treated as being socially/functionally identical

- See Prandy & Lambert (2003) for how this has been updated in more modern versions of CAMSIS
Development of CAMSIS

- Coding of Individuals
  - Reliant upon data derived from the International Standard for Classification of Occupations (ISCO) or from national censuses with regards to occupation
  - However, this has allowed for CAMSIS to portable across time and space
Development of CAMSIS

- Sample coding for the U.S. 2010 version of CAMSIS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STDEMPST</th>
<th>USEMPST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>&quot;Status unknown (usempst 1-5)&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>&quot;Self-employed (all) (usempst 1-3)&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>&quot;Self-employed (principals) (usempst 1 or 3)&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>&quot;Own account (ISCE-93 3) (not distinguishable for US-2000)&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>&quot;Employer (ISCE-93 2) (not distinguishable for US-2000)&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>&quot;Family worker (ISCE-93 5) (usempst 2)&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>&quot;Employee (ISCE-93 1) (usempst 4-5)&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>&quot;Missing, not known&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>&quot;Self-employed not incorporated&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>&quot;Family Worker&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>&quot;Self employed incorporated&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>&quot;Government employee&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>&quot;Private Employee&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Yes! There is a U.S. version of CAMSIS available on the CAMSIS website!
Development of CAMSIS

- And after performing all coding...
  - ...run the program.
  - More information is available on the CAMSIS website.
  - For detailed accounts of the statistics, coding, and other aspects of development you be direct to a number of books.
Applying CAMSIS

- CAMSIS has been gaining traction in its implementation/usage due to:
  - its portability
  - growing empirical support when compared across societies
  - ability to make time-wise comparisons
Applying CAMSIS

- CAMSIS is also well-suited for interacting with Social Network Analysis
- SoNOcS
- Lambert & Griffith (2018)
  - also available through UW Libraries
Applying CAMSIS

- CAMSIS has also been useful in providing a framework against to compare SSS
  - Subjective Social Status
- Research, largely in health fields, has explored how self-perceptions of social status and objective ratings of SES can interact
  - Singh-Manoux, Marmot, & Adler (2005)
Applying CAMSIS

- Quick Aside on SSS-
- “Bearing in mind that one significant strand in popular conceptualization is the denial of class categories and a preference for a hierarchical model of society [...], it is remarkable that a large majority of people are able to identify themselves as members of a class and, in particular, of a ‘working class’ or a ‘middle class’.”

  (Prandy, 2002, pp. 589)
Concluding Remarks
Other interesting citations:

- For the incorporation of Bourdieu and CAMSIS or SES:
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